

Broken symmetry, hyper-fermions and universal conductance in transport through a fractional quantum Hall edge.

V.V. Ponomarenko and D.V. Averin

Department of Physics and Astronomy, SUNY, Stony Brook, NY 11794, USA

(February 1, 2008)

We have found solution to a model of tunneling between a multi-channel Fermi liquid reservoir and an edge of the principal fractional quantum Hall liquid (FQHL) in the strong coupling limit. The solution explains how the absence of the time-reversal symmetry at high energies due to chiral edge propagation makes the universal two-terminal conductance of the FQHL fractionally quantized and different from that of a 1D Tomonaga-Luttinger liquid wire, where a similar model but preserving the time-reversal symmetry predicts unsuppressed free-electron conductance.

73.43.Jn, 71.10.Pm, 73.23.Ad

Low energy transport through an incompressible Quantum Hall liquid (QHL) with gapped bulk excitations is carried by gapless edge modes [1,2]. For principal FQHL of the filling factor $\nu = 1/\text{odd}$ these modes are described as a single branch of a chiral Luttinger liquid (χ LL) [3,4]. In presence of the right and left chiral edges, the model of the FQHL transport [5] appears to be equivalent to that of a metallic phase of a 1D interacting electron gas [6] known as the Tomonaga-Luttinger liquid (TLL). To describe the two-terminal transport experiments, external reservoirs have to be added [9,2] to the model so that the full transport process includes transformation of the reservoir electrons into the FQHL/TLL quasiparticles in the junctions. The transformation process makes the two-terminal conductance of both the TLL wire [7,8] and the narrow FQHL junctions [11,12] equal to the free electron conductance σ_0 . The standard experimental observation, however, is that the two-terminal FQHL conductance is equal to the Hall conductivity $\nu\sigma_0$ (see, e.g., [13]) but not σ_0 , the fact that implies equilibration between the chemical potentials of the reservoirs and the outgoing edges [10]. This problem was recently studied [14,12] for the junction modeled as a sequence of point-like contacts between the edge and different channels of a multi-channel Fermi-liquid (FL) reservoir under the assumption of suppressed quantum interference between electron tunneling at different contacts [12], e.g., due to finite decoherence length [14]. Then, currents injected into the edge at different points are directly related to the local values of the chemical potentials and can be added incoherently into a common current-voltage characteristic. Although this procedure reproduces equilibration between the edge and reservoir as the number of reservoir channels is increased, the model does not provide the reason for suppression of quantum interference of the channels at low energies. This drawback is very important, since in the low-energy limit any finite distance between the channels drops out from the solution and quantum interference is known [7,8] to reduce all the channels to a single tunneling mode. Therefore a quantum solution is needed to determine whether the

multi-channel tunneling model is complete or requires an additional decoherence mechanism for equilibration at physically relevant low energies.

In this work, we consider the above model of FQHL tunnel junction and find its quantum solution in the strong coupling limit. The zero frequency tunneling conductance obtained from this solution demonstrates three basic features. (1) The conductance depends on the assumed exchange statistics between electrons in the different reservoir channels which appears in our solution through the fermionic phase factor $e^{i\pi m}$ with in general arbitrary odd m . (2) The standard choice of the minimum statistical phase $m = \pm 1$ results in the conductance $G_1 = 2\sigma_0\nu/(1+\nu)$ of a single tunneling mode. This result does not depend on the actual number of the reservoir channels involved in tunneling. Such situation occurs [8] in tunneling between the reservoir and the TLL wire and, when the second reservoir is attached to the opposite end of the wire, results in the free electron conductance [11,12]. (3) The "hyper-fermionic" [4] statistics $m = 1/\nu$ of the electrons induced by their propagation along the edge leads to equilibration between the outgoing edge and reservoir chemical potentials with increasing number of reservoir channels even in the absence of any decoherence mechanisms [14].

The appropriate choice of the statistics can be made by minimization of energy or based on dynamics of charge propagation. A crossover occurs when the distance between the two tunneling point-contacts approaches an inverse momentum cut-off of the 1D edge excitations: For small separation between the contacts, the statistics is given by the minimum fermionic phase, and the tunneling is carried by a single tunneling mode, while for large separation the statistical phase is $1/\nu$ and the two reservoir channels can not be reduced to a single mode. A physical reason for the crossover is that an electron tunneling from the first channel into the edge at point x_1 and tunneling out at x_2 into the second channel propagates in the FQHL as a composite fermion [15] by absorbing even number $(1/\nu - 1)$ of fluxes. Therefore, its correlation function $\langle \psi(x_2, i\tau) \psi^\dagger(x_1, 0) \rangle \propto (v\tau + i(x_2 - x_1))^{-1/\nu}$

acquires a phase different from that of electrons in the chirally symmetric wire, where $\langle \psi(x_2, i\tau) \psi^\dagger(x_1, 0) \rangle \propto [(x_2 - x_1)^2 + (v\tau)^2]^{-(1/\nu-1)/2} / (v\tau + i(x_2 - x_1))$. The large-time asymptotics of both functions are the same. Therefore, additional phase in the FQHL edge, which changes the hyper-fermionic extension of statistics of the tunneling electrons, depends on geometry of the junction. Technically, this phase is introduced through the commutation relations between bosonic fields appearing in tunneling operators at different points. The commutator does not vanish, since these fields are not chirally symmetric. This chiral asymmetry of tunneling operators preserves time-reversal asymmetry of the quantum model even at low energies.

The model we consider represents n scattering channels of the spinless FL reservoir as free chiral fermions. Tunneling from the channels (labeled by $j = 1, \dots, n$) into the edge (labeled by 0) is assumed to be localized on the scale of magnetic length at the points x_j along the edge, where we take $x_j < x_i$ for $1 \leq i < j \leq n$. It is described by a tunnel Lagrangian:

$$\mathcal{L}_{tunn} = \sum_{j=1}^n [U_j \psi_0^+(x_j, t) \psi_j(x_j, t) + h.c.], \quad (1)$$

where U_j s are chosen real and positive. Bosonization expresses the operators of free electrons $\psi_j(x, t) = (2\pi\alpha)^{-1/2} \xi_j e^{i\phi_j(x, t)}$ in the reservoir channels and the operator of electrons propagating along the edge $\psi_0 = (2\pi\alpha)^{-1/2} \xi_0 e^{i\phi_0(x, t)/\sqrt{\nu}}$ through their associate bosonic fields ϕ_l , the Majorana fermions ξ_l accounting for their mutual statistics, and a common factor $1/\alpha$ denoting momentum cut-off of the edge excitations. Since the spatial dynamics of the reservoir channels does not affect the tunneling currents, velocities of these channels are irrelevant, and we take them as equal to the velocity v of the edge excitations. Free dynamics of the bosonic fields is governed then by the Lagrangian $\mathcal{L}_O = \sum_{l=0}^n (\phi_l \hat{K}^{-1} \phi_l)/2$, where the differential operator $\hat{K}^{-1}$ is:

$$\hat{K}^{-1} \phi_l(x, t) = \frac{1}{2\pi} \partial_x (\partial_t + v \partial_x) \phi_l(x, t). \quad (2)$$

The full Lagrangian $\mathcal{L} = \mathcal{L}_O + \mathcal{L}_\xi + \mathcal{L}_{tunn}$ also includes an additional kinematic part $\mathcal{L}_\xi = (1/4) \sum_l \xi_l \partial_t \xi_l$ describing a pure statistical dynamics of the Majorana fermions (time-ordering). A finite voltage applied to the reservoir is accounted for by the opposite-sign shift μ of the electrochemical potential of the edge. Since the chiral edge density ρ_0 is: $\rho_0 = \sqrt{\nu} \partial_x \phi_0 / (2\pi)$, this shift can be introduced by an additional non-equilibrium part of the Lagrangian $\mathcal{L}_V = \sqrt{\nu} / 2\pi \int dx \phi_0(x, t) \partial_x V(x)$, where $V(x) = -\mu \text{sgn}(x - y_X)$ and $y_X \rightarrow \infty$. With this choice of $V(x)$, the voltage introduced through $\mathcal{L}_V$ does not produce the edge current directly at $x < y_X$, and all the edge current $j_0 = v\rho_0$ caused by $\mathcal{L}_V$ in the interval $x_1 < x < y_X$ is just the opposite of the total tunneling current.

To explain the main idea of our calculation we first consider the strong coupling limit of a one-point contact ($n = 1$). The tunneling Lagrangian reduces to $\mathcal{L}_{tunn} = U_1 / (2\pi\alpha) \cos(\phi_0(x_1, t) / \sqrt{\nu} - \phi_1)$, and in the limit $U_1 \rightarrow \infty$ fixes the argument of the cos-term at one of the cosine maxima, say, $\phi_0(x_1, t) / \sqrt{\nu} = \phi_1(x_1, t)$. This semiclassical procedure leads to an effective Lagrangian that is quadratic in its vector-argument $\phi(x, t) = [\phi_0, \phi_1]^T$. Performing functional integration over ϕ one can find the two-component average $\bar{\phi}(x, t) \equiv \langle \phi(x, t) \rangle$ as

$$\bar{\phi}(x, t) = -i \frac{\sqrt{\nu}}{\pi} \int \frac{d\omega}{\omega} e^{-i\omega t - \frac{\alpha}{v} |\omega|} g(x, \omega) \mu(\omega), \quad (3)$$

where $-2\pi i g / \omega$ is the first column of the (2×2) matrix Green function. The two components $g_{0,1}(x)$ of the function g do not depend on $y_X \rightarrow \infty$ for $x < y_X$, and satisfy the homogeneous differential equation (2) at $x \neq x_1$ and therefore can be written as $g_{0,1} = a_{0,1} + b_{0,1} \exp[-i\omega x / v]$. The coefficients take different values $a_{0,1}^\varphi, b_{0,1}^\varphi$ for x smaller and larger than x_1 (φ denotes $<$ or $>$, respectively). They are related among themselves by four conditions: continuity of g_0 and g_1 ; continuity of the current flow: $\sqrt{\nu} b_0^< + b_1^< = \sqrt{\nu} b_0^> + b_1^>$; and maximum of the tunneling term: $g_0(x_1) - \sqrt{\nu} g_1(x_1) = 0$. The solution g is a linear combination of the four independent functions: $f_c^- = [\sqrt{\nu}, 1]^T, f_b^- = e^{i\omega x / v} f_c^-, f_1^{<,>} = \theta(\mp(x - x_1))(e^{i\omega x / v} - 1)[1, -\sqrt{\nu}]^T$, which are constructed to satisfy these conditions. Since propagation of tunneling electrons is governed by the diagonal free matrix Green function $K \times \mathbf{1}$, where (for ω below cut-off):

$$K(x - y, \omega) = -\frac{2\pi i}{\omega} \left[\frac{1}{2} + \theta(x - y) (e^{\frac{-i\omega(x-y)}{v}} - 1) \right], \quad (4)$$

we can find more restrictions on the coefficients: $b_{0,1}^< = 0, a_1^< = -a_1^>, a_0^\varphi = 1/2 - a_1^\varphi / \sqrt{\nu}$. They uniquely specify $g(x, \omega) = [\sqrt{\nu} f_c^- / 2 - f^>] / (1 + \nu)$. The currents follow then from Eq.(3) as $j_1(x, t) = -j_0 = \frac{2\nu}{1+\nu} \theta(x - x_1) \sigma_0 \bar{\mu}(t - [x - x_1] / v)$, where $\bar{\mu}(t)$ is the convolution of the function $\mu(t)$ with the normalized Lorentz factor of the width $1/D \equiv \alpha / v$. The tunneling conductance is equal to $G_1 = 2\nu \sigma_0 / (1 + \nu)$ in agreement with the result of application [12] of the chirally symmetric solution developed [6] for a point scatterer in TLL.

To extend this approach to the multi-channel contact, we notice that although the statistical factors $\pm \xi_0 \xi_j$ attributed to annihilation/creation of electrons in the j th channel can not be ignored for more than one j involved, they can be substituted [16] by the exponents $\exp\{\pm i\eta_j\}$ of the zero-energy bosonic fields satisfying $[\eta_i, \eta_j] = i\pi \gamma_{i,j}$ with odd integers $\gamma_{i,j} = -\gamma_{j,i}$. Different values of $\gamma_{i,j}$ correspond to different branches of the phase of the fermionic statistical factor (-1) arising from interchange of ξ_i and ξ_j . The pure statistical dynamics of the η -fields is described by the Lagrangian:

$\mathcal{L}_\eta = 1/2 \sum \eta_i \gamma'_{i,j} \partial_t \eta_j$, where $\gamma'_{i,j}$ are elements of the matrix inverse to the matrix $\gamma_{i,j}$. Substitution of the Majorana fermions by these bosonic modes transforms $\mathcal{L}_{tunn}$ into:

$$\mathcal{L}_{tunn} \equiv \sum_{j=1}^n \mathcal{L}_j = \sum \frac{U_j}{2\pi\alpha} \cos\left\{\frac{\phi_0(x_j, t)}{\sqrt{\nu}} - \phi_j - \eta_j\right\}. \quad (5)$$

The models defined by Lagrangians $\mathcal{L} = \mathcal{L}_O + \mathcal{L}_\eta + \mathcal{L}_{tunn}$ with different $\gamma_{i,j}$ are equivalent. This can be seen from comparison of their perturbative expansions in $\mathcal{L}_{tunn}$. Indeed, since any non-vanishing term of these expansions contains $\pm$ exponents in pairs, a proper interchange of the exponents cancels them all and leaves only the statistical sign. The sign is the same as one would get directly from the Majorana fermions and does not depend on the choice of matrix γ . When all U_j in (5) become large, the arguments of all the cosine functions take the values that maximize them. The semiclassical condition that these arguments can be simultaneously fixed, imposes restriction on the phase space of the system. This restriction depends on the choice of matrix γ , and the physically relevant γ can be determined by minimizing the energy contribution produced by this restriction. In the case of the two-point junction, there is only one parameter $\gamma \equiv \gamma_{2,1}$, and this can be done explicitly by using imaginary time representation of the Lagrangians, and evaluating [17] two parts of this contribution coming from modes with the energies above and below $T_{12} = v/(x_1 - x_2)$ as $(D - T_{12}) \ln[(1 + \nu)^2 + (\gamma\nu - 1)^2]$ and $T_{12} \ln[(1 + \nu)^2 + \gamma^2 \nu^2 - 1]$, respectively. The choice $\gamma = 1/\nu$ that makes the same-time commutator of the two cosine arguments in (5) vanish, minimizes the high-energy contribution. This means that this value of γ has to be used if the two tunneling points are well separated so that $T_{12} \ll D$. When, however, two tunneling points approach each other and $T_{12} \simeq D$, the low-energy contribution becomes more important, and the choice of γ has to be changed to the smallest value consistent with the statistics ($\gamma = 1$ in our case).

We can use the strong-coupling conditions to perform real-time calculation of the current flow in a multi-point contact. The real-time results provide another, more intuitive, interpretation of the choice of the statistical phases. We parametrize them as $\gamma_{i,j} = \gamma \text{sgn}(i - j)$, where γ is kept as a free parameter. This form is sufficiently general to describe the two-point contacts or contacts where all tunneling points are well-separated from one another. The strong-coupling conditions $\phi_0(x_j, t)/\sqrt{\nu} - \phi_j - \eta_j = 0$, $j = 1 \div n$ make Lagrangian of the model Gaussian, and linear relations between the currents and the bias voltage are determined by the retarded Green function. The calculation generalizes the one for the single-point contact. The average $\bar{\phi}(x, t)$ in Eq. (3) becomes the $(n + 1)$ -component vector $< [\phi_0, \dots, \phi_j + \eta_j, \dots]^T >$, and $-2\pi i g/\omega$ is the first column of the $(n + 1) \times (n + 1)$ matrix Green function. The coefficients $a_j, b_j, j = 1 \div n$ take different values a_j^φ, b_j^φ

for x smaller and larger than x_j , where φ denotes $<$ and $>$ as before. The edge channel coefficients a_0, b_0 take $(n + 1)$ different values, changing at each tunneling contact $x = x_j$ in a way that relates them to a_j, b_j by the four matching conditions derived above for the single-contact case. We denote with a_0^φ and b_0^φ their values for x smaller than x_n ($\varphi = <$) and larger than x_1 ($\varphi = >$). A set of $2(n + 1)$ independent vector-functions satisfying all these conditions can be chosen as: $f_c^- = [\sqrt{\nu}, 1, 1, 1, \dots]^T$, $f_b^- = e^{i\omega x/v} f_c^-$, $f_j^- = (e^{i\omega x/v} - e^{i\omega x_j/v}) e_j$, $f_j^+ = (e_0/\sqrt{\nu} - e_j) \theta(x - x_j) (e^{i\omega(x - x_j)/v} - 1) + \sum_{l=1}^{j-1} e_l (e^{i\omega(x_l - x_j)/v} - 1)/\nu$, where a vector e_l has the only non-zero l th component equal to 1. Since all $b_l^<$ coefficients of the function g are zero, it can be expanded in this basis as

$$g = s_c f_c^- + \sum_{j=1}^n s_j f_j^+ \quad (6)$$

with $(n + 1)$ unknown coefficients s_l . The non-zero s_j lead to finite jumps of a_j and b_j at $x = x_j$, and therefore, to the non-vanishing $b_j^> = -s_j e^{-i\omega x_j/v}$. Then, in accordance with Eq. (3), the reservoir channel currents arising at x_j can be found as $j_j(\omega, x) = 2\sqrt{\nu} \mu \sigma_0 b_j^> \theta(x - x_j) e^{i\omega x/v}$. Jumps of the coefficients a_j and b_j are caused by the charge tunneling at the contact points x_j , with further propagation of charge after tunneling governed by the free retarded Green function. This means that this function determines both the continuous parts of the a, b coefficients and the relations between their discontinuous parts and the coefficients s_j . The Green function is $(n + 1) \times (n + 1)$ matrix, and can be written as $K \times \mathbf{1} - \gamma \pi i \mathbf{C}/\omega$, where $\mathbf{C}$ is the antisymmetric matrix with all elements above the diagonal, except the first row, equal to 1. From this form one can find that $b_l^< = 0$ (the fact already used in Eq. (6)), and that the coefficients a_l are related to s_j . In particular: $a_0^< = 1/2 + \sum_{p=1}^n s_p/2\sqrt{\nu}$, $a_j^< = -s_j/2 + \gamma/2 \sum_{p \neq j} \text{sgn}(j - p) s_p$. From comparison of these relations with those obtained by direct substitution of the f -vectors into Eq. (6) we find n equations:

$$\frac{\sqrt{\nu}}{1 + \nu} + s_n = -\frac{1 - \gamma\nu}{1 + \nu} \sum_1^{n-1} s_i, \quad (7)$$

$$s_p = s_n + \sum_{j=p+1}^n \frac{2s_j}{(1 + \gamma)} [(1 - e^{i\omega(x_p - x_j)/v})/\nu - \gamma],$$

where $p = 1 \div (n - 1)$. Equations (7) allow us to determine all unknown coefficients s_j .

For the two-point contact these equations reduce to:

$$s_1 = (1 - \gamma + \frac{2}{\nu} [1 - e^{i\omega(x_1 - x_2)/v}]) \frac{s_2}{1 + \gamma},$$

$$s_2 = -\frac{\nu^{3/2}(1 + \gamma)}{2R}, \quad (8)$$

$$R \equiv 1 + \nu(1 - \gamma) + \frac{\nu^2}{2}(1 + \gamma^2) - (1 - \nu\gamma) e^{\frac{i\omega(x_1 - x_2)}{\nu}}.$$

The part of the denominator R proportional to $(1 - \nu\gamma)$ signals the appearance of an interference structure in the currents. Substituting $s_{1,2}$ (8) into $j_0(x, t) = -\int d\omega e^{-i\omega t - \alpha|\omega|} \sum_{1,2} j_j(\omega, x)$ one can see that, indeed, the time dependence of charge propagation along the edge exhibits multiple backscattering events at x_2 and x_1 : A charge wave started by the tunneling into the edge propagates from the point x_2 to x_1 with the velocity v and then instantly recoils back to x_2 from x_1 with a finite reflection coefficient proportional to $(1 - \nu\gamma)$. The formal possibility of the charge propagation with infinite velocity in the direction opposite to the edge chirality is a combined effect of x -independent solutions of the operator $\hat{K}^{-1}$ from (2) and the matching conditions at the tunneling points. However, this instant “counter-propagation” violates causality of the edge response to external perturbations and can not appear in the final physical results. This argument, in agreement with the minimization of the energy contributions, makes $\gamma = 1/\nu$ the only possible choice in the situation when x_1 and x_2 are well separated and $T_{12} \ll D$. When x_1 is so close to x_2 that T_{12} is on the order of D , the choice $\gamma = 1$ does not contradict the causality, since charge density $j_0(x, t)$ can not be split into two different parts located at these points.

A general expression for the zero-frequency tunneling conductance G valid for any value of γ and number of the reservoir channels n can be obtained from (7). The zero-frequency solution of the second of Eqs. (7) is: $s_{p-1} = qs_p$, $p = 2 \div n$, with $q = (1 - \gamma)/(1 + \gamma)$ and makes all s_j proportional to s_n . The conductance $G = -2\sigma_0\sqrt{\nu} \sum s_j$ is obtained then from the first of Eqs. (7):

$$G = \frac{2\nu[(1 + \gamma)^n - (1 - \gamma)^n]}{(1 + \nu\gamma)(1 + \gamma)^n - (1 - \nu\gamma)(1 - \gamma)^n}. \quad (9)$$

This expression shows how the conductance depends on the assumed exchange statistics between electrons in the different reservoir channels. The choice $\gamma = 1$ corresponds to the tunneling model where all point contacts are located closely to each other and for any n yields $G = G_1$, i.e., all reservoir channels are reduced to one tunneling mode. After incorporation of the similar tunneling junction with the second FL reservoir, the one-tunneling-mode conductance becomes equal [8,11] to the free electron conductance σ_0 . If all point contacts are well separated we should use $\gamma = 1/\nu$. The tunneling conductance is then $G = \sigma_0\nu(1 - q^n)$ and depends on the number of channels. When $n \rightarrow \infty$, it saturates at $\nu\sigma_0$. All currents calculated in this regime are temperature independent and coincide with those derived under the assumption of decoherence [12,14]. To our knowledge, this assumption does not have quantitative microscopic justification. In particular, due to chiral propagation along the edge, a large temperature by itself *does not* lead to decoherence [17]. As can be seen from the solution constructed above, the same incoherent addition of currents

can be obtained without decoherence, when separation of contacts leading to equilibration inside the edge is achieved by appropriate choice of statistical phases.

As a final point, we use the constructed strong coupling solution to discuss fluctuations of the tunnel currents in the multi-point junction. The fluctuations are characterized by the symmetric correlator of pairs of the fluctuating parts of the currents $j_i(x, t) - \langle j_i(x, t) \rangle$, $i = 0 \div n$. As before, when positions of the tunneling contacts allow a definite choice of factors γ , the phases in (5) are fixed in the strong coupling regime, and the Lagrangian acquires a Gaussian form. In this case, effect of the finite bias voltage in the Lagrangian is reduced to the shift of the ϕ averages which cancel out in the correlators. Therefore, the junction in this regime does not generate the shot noise, i.e., even at finite bias voltages the current fluctuations are the same as in equilibrium, and at zero frequency vanish linearly with temperature.

In conclusion, we have found the strong-coupling solution of the model of tunneling between the multi-channel Fermi-liquid reservoir and an edge of the principal FQHL. Solution depends on the choice of the statistical phase branches of the different channels. When the reservoir channels tunnel into the edge at well-separated points, the phase branches are uniquely determined by the requirement of conservation of the initial commutation symmetry of the appropriate parts of the tunneling Lagrangian. Additional statistical phases can be interpreted as even number of fluxes absorbed/emitted by electrons tunneling into the edge that transform them into composite fermions. As tunneling points approach one another, the regular statistical phases $\pm\pi$ are restored and the multi-channel tunneling is reduced to a single tunneling mode. Our results explain the difference between transport through the 1D FQHL edge and the Tomonaga-Luttinger-liquid wire: The two terminal universal conductance of the edge is renormalized by the flux attachment, while direct electron-electron interaction in the wire does not change its universal free-electron conductance.

V.P. acknowledges fruitful discussions with N. Nagaosa and M. Buttiker on the preliminary stage of this work. This work was supported by the NSA and ARDA under the ARO contract.

-
- [1] B.I. Halperin, Phys. Rev. B **25**, 2185 (1982); P.Streda *et al.*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **59**, 1973 (1987).
 - [2] M. Buttiker, Phys. Rev. B **38**, 9375 (1988).
 - [3] X.G. Wen, Phys. Rev. Lett. **64**, 2206 (1990); J. Fröhlich and T. Kerler, Nucl. Phys. B[FS] **354**, 369 (1991); N. Nagaosa and M. Kohmoto, Phys. Rev. Lett. **75**, 4294 (1995).
 - [4] M. Stone and M.P.A. Fisher Int. J. Mod. Phys. B **8**, 2539

- (1994).
- [5] X.G. Wen, Phys. Rev. B **44**, 5708 (1991); K.Moon *et al.*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **71**, 4381 (1993).
 - [6] C.L. Kane and M.P.A. Fisher, Phys. Rev. B **46**, 15233 (1992).
 - [7] S. Tarucha, T. Honda, and T. Saku, Solid State Commun. **94**, 413 (1995); R. de Picciotto *et al.*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **85**, 1730 (2000); A. Yacoby *et al.*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **77**, 4612 (1996).
 - [8] V.V. Ponomarenko, Phys. Rev. B **52**, R8666 (1995); **54**, 10328 (1996); D.L. Maslov and M. Stone, Phys. Rev. B **52**, R5539 (1995); I. Safi and H.J. Schulz, Phys. Rev. B **52**, R17040 (1995).
 - [9] R. Landauer, Philos. Mag. **21**, 863 (1970).
 - [10] X.G. Wen, Int. J. Phys. **B6**, 1711 (1992); A.Yu. Alekseev *et al.*, Phys. Rev. B **54**, 17320 (1996).
 - [11] D.B. Chklovskii and B.I. Halperin, Phys. Rev. B **57**, 3781 (1998).
 - [12] C. Chamon and E. Fradkin, Phys. Rev. B **56**, 2012 (1997).
 - [13] A.M. Chang *et al.*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **77**, 2538 (1996); A.M.Chang and J.E. Cunningham, Surf. Science **229**, 216 (1990).
 - [14] C.L.Kane and M.P.A. Fisher, Phys. Rev. B **52**, 17393 (1995).
 - [15] J.K. Jain, Phys. Rev. Lett. **63**, 199 (1989).
 - [16] V.V. Ponomarenko and D.V. Averin, JETP Lett. **74**, 87 (2001).
 - [17] V.V. Ponomarenko and D.V. Averin, in preparation.

